

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
Plaintiff,)
vs.)
RAMIZ ZIJAD HODZIC,) No. 4:15 CR 00049 CDP (DDN)
SEDINA UNKIC HADZIC,)
NIHAD ROSIC,)
MEDIHA MEDY SALICEVIC, and)
ARMIN HARCVIC,)
Defendants.)

**DEFENDANT'S JOINT REQUEST ON BEHALF OF ALL DEFENDANTS
FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME
TO FILE "TRADITIONAL" PRETRIAL MOTIONS
AND EVIDENCE OF AN AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

Comes now Defendant Nihad Rosic, by and through undersigned counsel, and on behalf of all Defendants, Requests an Extension of Time to File “Traditional” Pretrial Motions and Evidence of an Affirmative Defense. In support of said Request, Defendant Rosic, on behalf of all Defendants, hereby states as follows:

1. On June 20, 2016, this Court entered its Order (Doc. 305) relative to the filing of “Traditional” Pretrial Motions which provided that each Defendant would have until October 14, 2016, to file said Motion(s); the Government would have until November 4, 2016, in which to Respond; the Defendants would have until November 11, 2016, to Reply; and the Evidentiary Hearing would be set for the week of December 12, 2016, excluding December 15, 2016.

2. On August 23, 2016, this Court entered its Order (Doc. 329) which provided that any Defendant would have until October 14, 2016, in which to file an offer of evidence of an affirmative defense.

3. At the Status Conference on August 30, 2016, defense counsel brought to the Court's attention the extremely glacial process they were encountering with regard to having requested items of discovery translated by its translators; further, at said Conference the Government also indicated that additional discovery would be forthcoming and it also had additional documents to be translated prior to being provided Defendants.

4. Since the last Status Conference on August 30, 2016, all defense counsel have been engaged in the writing and research necessary for the filing of their respective "Traditional" Pretrial Motions, as well as research and documents relative to the filing his or her evidence of an affirmative defense; however, it is readily apparent to counsel, it is absolutely necessary to have access to certain translated documents prior to such filings and it has been determined that such translations will not be available for at least ninety (90) days.

5. Further, the Government advised this past week that there was to be an additional 2,000 – 3,000 pages of documents to be provided defense counsel and, in addition, there was an additional approximately 500 pages of documents to be translated prior to being tendered to defense counsel.

6. Given the extreme complexity of this matter, as well as the voluminous discovery heretofore received, and to be received, and the absolute necessity of obtaining

translations of these documents, Defendants collectively request additional time to prepare and file their respective “Traditional” Pretrial Motions, to wit:

Defendants filing of “Traditional” Pretrial Motions: **January 30, 2017**

Government’s Response: **February 20, 2017**

Defendant’s Reply: **March 1, 2017**

Evidentiary Hearing: **To Commence the week of March 20, 2017**

7. As previously stated, this Motion for additional time addresses only those “Traditional” Pretrial Motions to be filed herein.

8. This request for an extension of the Motion deadline certainly would not preclude any individual Defendant from filing a Motion before it is due.

9. As to the schedule for presenting an offer evidence of an affirmative defense to be decided by the Jury, Defendants collectively request that the schedule be amended as follows, to-wit:

Defendants filing an offer of evidence: **January 30, 2017**

Government’s Response: **February 20, 2017**

Defendant’s Reply: **March 1, 2017**

10. The requested extension of time is not prejudicial to any party hereunder and the interests of justice would be best served by the granting of this Motion for Extension of Time for the Filing of “Traditional” Pretrial Motions as well as the deadline for filing an offer of evidence of an affirmative defense.

11. Undersigned counsel have discussed the filing of this Motion with Matthew Drake, Assistance United States Attorney, and he has no objection to its filing of the instant Motion.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, Defendants collectively pray that the Honorable Court vacate its Orders of June 20, 2016 (Doc. 305) and August 23, 2016 (Doc. 329); that new Orders be published in conformity with this Motion or, alternatively, to a schedule that meets with the Court's schedule; and for such other and further Orders as the Court deems meet and proper in the premises.

Respectfully submitted,

/S/ ***JoANN TROG***
JoANN TROG 42725MO
Attorney for Defendant Nihad Rosic
121 West Adams Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63122
Telephone: (314) 821-1111
Facsimile: (314) 821-9798
E-Mail: Jtrogmwb@aol.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 3rd day of October, 2016, the foregoing was filed electronically with the Clerk of the Court to be served by operation of the Court's electronic filing system upon Matthew Drake, Kenneth Tihen and Howard Marcus, Assistant United States Attorney, 111 South 10th Street, 20th Floor, St. Louis, Missouri 63102 and Mara M. Kohn and Joshua D. Champagne, United States Department of Justice, 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530; Diane Dragon, Kevin Curran and Michael Dwyer, Attorneys for Defendant Ramiz Zijad Hodzic, 1010 Market Avenue, Suite 200, Saint Louis, Missouri 63101; Paul D'Agrossa and Susan Kister, Attorney for Defendant Sedina Unkic Hodzic, 7710 Carondelet Avenue, Suite 200, Clayton, Missouri 63105; Andrea E. Gambino, Attorney for Defendant Mediha Medy Salkicevic, 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Suite 224, Chicago, Illinois 60604; and Charles D. Swift and Catherine McDonald, Attorneys for Defendant Armin Harcevic, 833 E. Arapaho Road, Suite 102, Richardson, Texas 75081.

/S/ ***JoANN TROG***